

Board of Directors of the Denver Union Station Project Authority  
c/o Dawn Bookhardt  
Bookhardt & O'Toole  
1675 Broadway, Suite 2580  
Denver, Colorado 80202

November 30, 2009

Dear Fellow Board Members:

Prior to my appointment to the Denver Union Station Project Authority, I was among the voices advocating for a moving walkway to help ease the burden of passengers travelling from the light rail to the historic station. In particular I was concerned about easing the distance for those with disabilities and the elderly. Since that time a number of engineering requirements have dictated a change in the design of the bus facility and the moving walkway, to the point where I no longer believe it serves its intended purpose, and in some regards may actually negatively impact access. **For the reasons outlined below, I am writing to recommend that we as a board direct Bill Mosher and the design team to remove the moving walkway from the underground bus facility design going forward.** Although my recommendation is motivated by design considerations, I also believe it to be prudent for the project financially, as the walkway is estimated to cost between \$2 and 4 million to construct and an unknown but costly amount to operate and maintain.

First, I would like to outline the deficiencies in the current design.

- 1) **The walkway is too short to sufficiently aid in covering the distance in the terminal and cannot be lengthened.** The public concourse inside the bus terminal is currently 783 feet long. The design includes two moving walkway segments at lengths of 143 feet and 74 feet, for a total of 217 feet, therefore covering only 27% of the concourse. My first desire would have been to urge the design team to improve the walkway by lengthening it, but I have learned this is not possible due to the need to locate emergency exits and ticketing at locations where the moving walkway would otherwise have operated.
- 2) **The walkway is also only one person wide going in either direction and cannot be widened.** At just over 3 feet wide, an individual will not be able to hold the hand of a child or an elderly person next to them or hold a suitcase on wheels at their side. The walkways cannot be widened without severely limiting the flow of people on either side of the walkway due to the fact that that space is needed for both movement along the terminal and for queuing to get onto buses at the various slip spots. Although some wheelchair users do use moving

walkways, for many it can be difficult to navigate mounting and dismounting these walks, and I am concerned about those who do not use the walkway having a much narrower and crowded space to navigate through due to the constricted space created alongside the walkways.

**3) The existence of the moving walkway severely limits the amount of seating available throughout the terminal.**

After learning of these deficiencies, I requested information and drawings through Bill Mosher and the design team as to what would happen to flow and seating if the walkways were removed. The drawings are attached to this letter.

- 1) Depending on alternative design selected, the passenger flow expands from two 5 foot passageways on either side of the walkways in the current design, to one broad passageway of approximately 16 to 21 feet without the walkways.
- 2) Seating expands from 30 benches to up to 62 benches depending on alternative design.

Since my inquiries into this matter, I have learned that the Peer Design Review team that we established has reviewed the same information and drawings and has unanimously voted to recommend removal of the moving walkways.

Finally, I have inquired with experts on the American's with Disabilities Act (ADA) both inside our design team and a professional working for the City and County of Denver, and both confirmed that the moving walkways are **not** required by the American's with Disabilities Act or any other accessibility regulation. One expert believed that the current walkways would still help some individuals with disabilities or limitations; the other thought removal would benefit more individuals through expanded space to navigate without being crowded and through opportunities to sit and rest.

After carefully weighing the limited benefits of the walkways and the inability to improve them against the access and seating limitations they create and the considerable cost of building and maintaining them, I believe it is in the best interests of the public to eliminate the moving walkways from the design moving forward. I hope that you will agree, and I look forward to discussing this matter as a board at an upcoming DUSPA meeting.

Sincerely,

Robin Kniech  
DUSPA Board Member